

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

MICHAEL F. BAILEY, #273498	)	
	)	
Petitioner,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	Civil Action No.: 3:08-268-TLW-JRM
	)	
	)	
	)	
A.J. PADULA	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	
_____	)	

**ORDER**

Petitioner, Michael F. Bailey, (“petitioner”), brought this civil action, *pro se*, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 on January 25, 2008. (Doc. #1).

This matter now comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Joseph R. McCrorey to whom this case had previously been assigned. (Doc. # 37). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that Respondent’s motion for summary judgment be granted, and the petition dismissed without an evidentiary hearing. (Doc. # 37).The petitioner filed no objections to the report. Objections were due on September 18, 2009.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v.

Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

After careful review the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, the court **ACCEPTS** the Report (Doc. # 37). Therefore, for the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Respondent's motion for summary judgment is **GRANTED**, and the petition **DISMISSED** without an evidentiary hearing. (Doc. # 37).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Terry L. Wooten  
United States District Judge

December 16, 2009  
Florence, South Carolina